REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on September 18, 2008.

Claims1, 6, and 9 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims1-16 remain pending in this application.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

Claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended to refer to routing packets. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

§103 Rejections of the Claims

Rejection in view of the combination of AAPA and Furukawa

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art, 'AAPA' (Figure 1 of the present application), and in view of Furukawa (U.S. 2006/0036768).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a router for interconnecting a computer network formed by a plurality of client hardware elements and a server network segment, "the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range and to block packets on the basis of respective addresses being from the exclusive address range." Figure 1 of the present application illustrates a traditional system environment with same IP address ranges, where access to the server LAN is regulated by means of access lists, i.e., where access lists administered in the router form the basis for allowing or blocking connections. (Specification, [0009].) An example provided in [0009] illustrates that packets associated with addresses within the shared address range are being treated differently based on the information present in the access list. Therefore, the description of a traditional system in [009] of the present application and the associated Figure 1 teach away from a router

for interconnecting a computer network formed by a plurality of client hardware elements and a server network segment, "the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range," as recited in claim 1. This deficiency is not remedied by combining the system illustrated in Figure 1 with Furukawa that merely mentions a private address communication range and a non-private address communication range (Furukawa, [0102] and Fig. 18). Thus, the combination of Figure 1 of the present application and Furukawa fails to disclose or suggest "the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range" recited in claim 1.

The Office Action correctly stated that the prior art system of Figure 1 fails to disclose or suggest "server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range ... wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range" recited in claim 1. The Office Action turns to Furukawa to show this feature. Specifically, the Office Action cites Furukawa describing an external area of an IP network where the addresses are subdivided into both the private address communication range (directed to intra-corporation communication) and the non-private address communication range (directed to inter-corporate communication). (Furukawa, [0102] and Fig. 18.) As is evident from Figure 18, the two address ranges in Furukawa are not shown to be associated with a server network segment. Furthermore, Furukawa, whether considered separately or in combination with the Figure 1 of the present application (AAPA), fails to disclose or suggest a router that interconnects a server network segment with a computer network formed by a plurality of client hardware elements, the router being set up to, on one hand, block packets on the basis of respective addresses being from the exclusive address range and, on the other hand, route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range.

Using the language of claim 1, the combination of Furukawa and AAPA fail to disclose or suggest "the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range and at least one third access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range and the at

least one third access address range is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range, each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range or the exclusive address range and the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range and to block packets on the basis of respective addresses being from the exclusive address range." Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim 6, as amended, recites "the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range." Claim 6 is thus patentable and should be allowed in view of the combination of Furukawa and AAPA for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 9, as amended, recites "setting up a router for interconnection of the computer network with the server network segment in such a manner that the router routes within the shared access address range." Claim 9 and its dependent claims are thus patentable and should be allowed in view of the combination of Furukawa and AAPA for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 9 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Rejection in view of the combination of AAPA, Furukawa, and Lakshman

Claims 5, 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'AAPA' and Furukawa as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, in further view of Lakshman et al. (U.S. 5,951,651).

Lakshman describes a filter method for designating packet filter rules contained in a router (Lakshman, Abstract.) Claims 5 and 8, and claim 13 depend on claims 1 and 9 respectively and therefore are patentable in view of the combination of AAPA and Furukawa for the reasons discussed above. Combining AAPA and Furukawa with Lakshman does not cure the

deficiencies of the previously-discussed AAPA and Furukawa combination with respect to features present in claims 5, 8, and 13 by virtue of their being dependent on their respective dependent claims. Applicants therefore request the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 5, 8, and 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 278-4052 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(408) 278-4042

Date ___December 4, 2008___   By ___/Elena Dreszer/___
                                            Elena B. Dreszer
                                            Reg. No. 55, 128

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 4, 2008.

___Dawn R. Shaw___   ___/Dawn R. Shaw/___
Name   Signature